

REMARKS

In the April 6, 2007 Office Action, claims 1, 11-15 and 18 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 2-10, 16, 17 and 19 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the April 6, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 3 and 16 as indicated above. Also, Applicants have added new claims 20 and 21. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-21 are pending, with claims 1, 2, 3 and 16 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0092519 to Fukada (hereinafter "Fukada publication"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites *a motor linkage* coupled between the output shaft and the derailleur linkage to *move the chain guide between a first shift position corresponding to the first rotational position and a second shift position corresponding to the second rotational position* in response to rotation of the output shaft, and the motor linkage including *a jamming protection arrangement* that is configured and arranged with respect to the derailleur linkage to move between a force transmitting state in which the motor linkage forms a rigid force transmitting connection to move the chain guide and a force

override state in which the motor linkage forms a non-rigid force overriding connection due to a jamming force being transmitted by the derailleur linkage to the motor linkage such that ***the motor can rotate to the first rotational position from the second rotational position when the chain guide is jammed in the second shift position.*** Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Fukada publication or any other prior art of record.

Specifically, the paragraphs [0069]-[0073] of the Fukada publication merely disclose a microcomputer 80 for stopping a motor 72. More specifically, the paragraphs [0071] and [0072] of the Fukada publication disclose that "The motor 72 is preferably a reversible motor ... so as to move the derailleur 28 between first and second shift or present component positions", and that "... , when the motor 72 begins to lock up, ... an over current signal is sent ... to the central processing unit of the microcomputer 80 to stop the electricity from energizing the motor 72". In other words, the motor 72 is stopped when a chain guide 52 is jammed in a second shift position. Therefore, the motor 72 does *not* rotate to a first rotational position corresponding to a first shift position from a second rotational position corresponding to a second shift position when the chain guide 52 is jammed in the second shift position. Accordingly, the Fukada publication does *not* disclose ***a motor linkage coupled between the output shaft and the derailleur linkage to move the chain guide between a first shift position corresponding to the first rotational position and a second shift position corresponding to the second rotational position*** in response to rotation of the output shaft, and the motor linkage including ***a jamming protection arrangement*** that is configured and arranged with respect to the derailleur linkage to move between a force transmitting state in which the motor linkage forms a rigid force transmitting connection to move the chain guide and a force override state in which the motor linkage forms a non-rigid force overriding connection due to a jamming force being transmitted by the derailleur linkage to the motor

linkage such that *the motor can rotate to the first rotational position from the second rotational position when the chain guide is jammed in the second shift position* as recited in independent claim 1.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose *each* and *every* element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claim 18 is also allowable over the prior art of record in that it depends from independent claim 1, and therefore is allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claim is further allowable because it includes additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claim.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fukada publication in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,676,616 to Hara (hereinafter "Hara patent"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 as mentioned above.

Applicants believe that dependent 11-15 are allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Moreover, the Hara patent does not remedy the deficiencies of the Fukada publication. Specifically, the Hara patent merely discloses a front derailleur 14 having screws 28, 32 for facilitating adjustment of the derailleur 14. Accordingly, the Hara patent *fails to* provide the deficiencies for the Fukada publication.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 2-10, 16, 17 and 19 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, Applicants have amended claims 2, 3 and 16 to place them in independent form. Thus, independent claims 2, 3 and 16 are believed to be allowable.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 4-10 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 3, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 4-10 are further allowable because they include additional limitations.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 20 and 21 by the current Amendment. Applicants believe that new claims 20 and 21 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 2, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 20 and 21 are further allowable because they include additional limitations.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-21 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ David L. Tarnoff /
David L. Tarnoff
Reg. No. 32,383

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: 07/03/2007